

Application No. 09/928,610

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending in the application. Claims 1-32 stand rejected. Claims 1, 12, and 22 are hereby amended. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of the claims.

Rejections Based Upon 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-9, 11-13, 16-19, 21-22, 25-30, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,026,078 (Smith). Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 now requires, in part, a communication hub having a control system configured to switch between either a configuration mode or an operation mode. A mode selection interface receives a user input selecting either the configuration mode or the operation mode. When in the configuration mode, the communication hub is configured to process a registration request from an authorized communication device to authorize the communication device. When in the operation mode, the communication hub is configured to exchange communications between previously registered communication devices, the newly registered communication device, and a network system.

In contrast, Smith fails to disclose a hub that switches between either a configuration mode or an operation mode and a mode selection interface that receives a user input selecting either the configuration mode or the operation mode. In particular, Smith discloses a hub 44 that switches between two operation modes- a hub mode and a station mode- in response to an input from a mode selector 56. The mode selector 56 selects between two operation modes rather than between an operation mode and a configuration mode, as required by claim 1. While the hub mode in Smith could include two sub-modes - an operation mode (exchanging communications between stations, col. 3, lines 10-30) and a configuration mode (authorizing stations, col. 3, lines 40-60)- the hub does not switch between the two sub modes based on an input from the mode selector 56, also as required by claim 1.

Independent claims 12 and 22 are allowable for reasons similar to claim 1. Applicant refrains from a discussion of the dependent claims for the sake of brevity.

Application No. 09/928,610

CONCLUSION

The claims in their present form are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore solicits their allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Stephen S. Roche, Reg. No. 52,176
Setter Ollila LLC
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 15
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004
Attn: Harley R. Ball
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100